

## REMARKS

Attorney for Applicant has carefully reviewed the outstanding Office Action on the above-identified application.

The Office Action notes that Claims 1-55 are pending in the present application, and only Claims 1-55 appear to have been examined. Applicant believes this to be an error, as the present application was filed with Claims 1-56. As such, Applicant request that the foregoing error be corrected, and that dependent Claim 56 also be examined.

Claims 1-55 were rejected in the Office Action as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,029,149 to Dykstra, et al. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant's claimed invention relates to an automated loan risk assessment system and method. The invention calculates a risk score for a loan based upon a plurality of risk factors, such as a fraud risk factor, an underwriting risk factor, and a property valuation risk factor. The risk score can be used by a loan service provider in deciding whether to fund or insure the loan.

Dykstra, et al. relates to a lender direct credit evaluation and loan processing system. The invention allows loan application information to be entered at a remote terminal and processed at a central processing unit. A credit bureau is accessed by the central processing unit, and the applicant's credit score is retrieved. Based on the credit score, the loan is either approved or

declined. The application process requires no human intervention except for entering information about the loan.

All of the independent claims of the present application (i.e., independent Claims 1, 15, 29, and 43) each recite calculating a risk score for a loan based on a plurality of risk factors including at least two of a fraud risk factor ... and a property valuation risk factor. Dykstra, et al. fails whatsoever to disclose these claimed features. The Office Action points broadly to the Abstract and column 3, lines 32-67 and columns 4-7, lines 1-67 of Dykstra, et al. as disclosing such features. However, neither these sections, nor the entirety of Dykstra, et al., disclose such features.

First, Dykstra, et al. fails whatsoever to disclose calculating a risk score, as set forth in all of the pending claims. Rather, Dykstra, et al. only mentions retrieving a credit score from a credit bureau to determine whether to approve or deny a loan. No mention is made of calculating a risk score.

Second, Dykstra, et al. fails entirely to disclose calculating a risk score based on a plurality of risk factors including at least two of a fraud risk factor ... and a property valuation factor. A simple word search of the entire text of Dykstra, et al. reveals no mention of the words “fraud” or “property,” and no concepts similar to fraud or property valuation risk factors are disclosed or even contemplated in Dykstra, et al. As such Claims 1-56 are clearly patentable over Dykstra, et al.

All issues raised in the Office Action are believed to have been addressed. Claims 1-56 are pending and are in condition for allowance. Re-examination is requested and favorable action solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: 4/30/2007

Mark E. Nikolsky  
Reg. No. 48,319  
Attorney for Applicant  
McCarter & English, LLP  
Four Gateway Center  
100 Mulberry Street  
Newark, NJ 07102  
Tel: (973) 639-6987  
Fax: (973) 297-6624